Case: 5:15-cr-00323-DAP Doc #: 60 Filed: 11/09/17 1 of 17. PageID #: 487

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO EASTERN DIVISION		1
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, : Case No. 5:15-cr-00323 : Plaintiff, : Cleveland, Ohio : Wednesday, : September 27, 2017 : 10:21 a.m. DAVID K. TURNER, : Defendant. : Defendant. : TRANSCRIPT OF RESENTENCING PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE HONORABLE DAN A. POLSTER UNITED STATES DISTRICT Court Reporter: Donnalee Cotone, RMR, CRR NCRA Realtime Systems Administrate United States District Court 801 West Superior Avenue Court Reporters 7-189 Cleveland, Ohio 44113 216-357-7078	NORTHE	DISTRICT OF OHIO
Wednesday, September 27, 2017 10:21 a.m. DAVID K. TURNER, Defendant. TRANSCRIPT OF RESENTENCING PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE HONORABLE DAN A. POLSTER UNITED STATES DISTRICT Court Reporter: Donnalee Cotone, RMR, CRR NCRA Realtime Systems Administrate United States District Court 801 West Superior Avenue Court Reporters 7-189 Cleveland, Ohio 44113 216-357-7078		
: September 27, 2017 : 10:21 a.m. DAVID K. TURNER, : Defendant. : TRANSCRIPT OF RESENTENCING PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE HONORABLE DAN A. POLSTER UNITED STATES DISTRICT Court Reporter: Donnalee Cotone, RMR, CRR NCRA Realtime Systems Administrate United States District Court 801 West Superior Avenue Court Reporters 7-189 Cleveland, Ohio 44113 216-357-7078	Plaintiff,	: Cleveland, Ohio
: 10:21 a.m. DAVID K. TURNER, Defendant. : Defendant. : TRANSCRIPT OF RESENTENCING PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE HONORABLE DAN A. POLSTER UNITED STATES DISTRICT Court Reporter: Donnalee Cotone, RMR, CRR NCRA Realtime Systems Administrate United States District Court 801 West Superior Avenue Court Reporters 7-189 Cleveland, Ohio 44113 216-357-7078	V.	
TRANSCRIPT OF RESENTENCING PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE HONORABLE DAN A. POLSTER UNITED STATES DISTRICT Court Reporter: Donnalee Cotone, RMR, CRR NCRA Realtime Systems Administrate United States District Court 801 West Superior Avenue Court Reporters 7-189 Cleveland, Ohio 44113 216-357-7078	DAVID K. TURNER,	
TRANSCRIPT OF RESENTENCING PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE HONORABLE DAN A. POLSTER UNITED STATES DISTRICT Donnalee Cotone, RMR, CRR NCRA Realtime Systems Administrate United States District Court 801 West Superior Avenue Court Reporters 7-189 Cleveland, Ohio 44113 216-357-7078	Defendant.	: : V
BEFORE THE HONORABLE DAN A. POLSTER UNITED STATES DISTRICT Court Reporter: Donnalee Cotone, RMR, CRR NCRA Realtime Systems Administrate United States District Court 801 West Superior Avenue Court Reporters 7-189 Cleveland, Ohio 44113 216-357-7078		X
Donnalee Cotone, RMR, CRR NCRA Realtime Systems Administrate United States District Court 801 West Superior Avenue Court Reporters 7-189 Cleveland, Ohio 44113 216-357-7078	TDANGCDIDT OF	CENTENCING DDOCEEDINGS
Court Reporter: Donnalee Cotone, RMR, CRR NCRA Realtime Systems Administrate United States District Court 801 West Superior Avenue Court Reporters 7-189 Cleveland, Ohio 44113 216-357-7078	BEFORE THE H	DRABLE DAN A. POLSTER
NCRA Realtime Systems Administrate United States District Court 801 West Superior Avenue Court Reporters 7-189 Cleveland, Ohio 44113 216-357-7078	ONTIL	
NCRA Realtime Systems Administrate United States District Court 801 West Superior Avenue Court Reporters 7-189 Cleveland, Ohio 44113 216-357-7078		
801 West Superior Avenue Court Reporters 7-189 Cleveland, Ohio 44113 216-357-7078	Court Reporter:	CRA Realtime Systems Administrator
216-357-7078		1 West Superior Avenue ourt Reporters 7-189
donnalee_cotone@ohnd.uscourts.gov		.6-357-7078
		nnalee_cotone@ohnd.uscourts.gov

Ca	Se. 3.13-01-00323-DAF Duc #. 0	2
1	APPEARANCES (Continued	1):
2		
3	For the Government:	
4		Assistant United States Attorney 801 West Superior Avenue Suite 400
5		Cleveland, Ohio 44113 216-622-3965
6		brian.mcdonough@usdoj.gov
7	For the Defendant:	Carolyn M. Kucharski, Assistant Federal Public Defender
8		Office of the Federal Public Defender 1660 West 2nd Street, Suite 750
9		Cleveland, Ohio 44113-1454 216-522-4856
10		carolyn_kucharski@fd.org
11	For Probation:	David Abraham
12	Special FBI Agent:	Suzanne Lewis-Johnson
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
2425	Proceedings recorded by produced by computer-a	y mechanical stenography, transcript ided transcription.

1	MORNING SESSION, WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 27, 2017
2	(Proceedings commenced at 10:21 a.m.)
3	
4	THE COURT: All right. Our next matter this
10:22:01 5	morning is case 5:15-cr-00323, United States versus David K.
6	Turner.
7	Mr. Turner is here with Ms. Kucharski, Mr. McDonough
8	for the government, Mr. Abraham for probation.
9	I initially sentenced Mr. Turner to 238 months
10:22:26 10	custody. The Court of Appeals determined that I hadn't
11	properly I may have used referred to the wrong
12	guideline section and did not properly explain the two-level
13	enhancement for use of a cell phone or computer device.
14	So he's remanded for resentencing. Mr. Abraham
10:22:55 15	prepared a revised report, which I received and reviewed.
16	Mr. Turner, have you reviewed the revised report,
17	dated July 14th?
18	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.
19	THE COURT: And have you had a chance to
10:23:13 20	discuss it fully with Ms. Kucharski and ask her any
21	questions that you might have?
22	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor.
23	THE COURT: All right. There are a number of
24	objections.
10:23:22 25	What objections have not been taken care of that I

need to deal with now?

1

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

10:24:58 25

10:23:39 5

10:23:52 10

10:24:12 15

10:24:39 20

MS. KUCHARSKI: Your Honor, I believe that the two main objections are paragraph 59, which deals with the computer enhancement, and then the paragraph 64, which deals with the five levels which the Court did not apply the last time.

THE COURT: All right. I'm going to take care of that quickly.

First, I went through that at the initial sentencing. I determined that the facts did not warrant that five-level enhancement. The government didn't appeal it, so I don't think I have jurisdiction to revisit it. I think that any objection is waived.

But even if I do have jurisdiction, the facts haven't changed, and so I'm not going to apply it.

By the same token, the facts haven't changed for the two-level enhancement, and the facts warrant a two-level enhancement under 2G2.1(b)(6)(B)(ii).

Mr. Turner used his cell phone and Facebook to lure the minor victim to run away and have sex with him, and ultimately videotaped both of them having sex. So I didn't make that clear initially, but I'm making it clear now. So the two-level enhancement applies. So that's how I'm dealing with those objections.

So I take it there are no other objections of any

1 | consequence that I need to address?

MS. KUCHARSKI: No, Your Honor, but just for purposes of the record, we would incorporate the sentencing memo that we filed with regards to our objection to that two-level enhancement and just note briefly for the record that that two levels comes along with the count of sexual exploitation of a minor by production of sexually explicit material.

And it's our position that that enhancement should not be applied when there was no contact with the minor directly or someone in loco parentis of the minor with respect to -- the computer was not used in that regard for this production count.

THE COURT: Well, I don't believe the computer has to be used directly with the minor.

The computer was used to help Mr. Turner commit the offense and commit the harm connected with the offense, as I've just spelled out.

MS. KUCHARSKI: But it has to be used in connection with the production of the video that he made.

THE COURT: Well, I don't believe it does.

MS. KUCHARSKI: Okay. Well, we just note our objection for the record.

THE COURT: All right. And I believe it was also used to videotape Mr. Turner and the victim. So that

10:25:34 10

16

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

11

12

10:25:13 5

18

19

17

10:26:08 20

21

22

23

10:26:20 25

1 clearly was used in the production. That finding was used 2 in the production, the actual production of the video. It 3 contained the child pornography. So it was used both to 4 lure the victim and to produce the child pornography explicitly. 10:26:52 5 All right. Well, I'll hear from both sides, and, of 6 7 course, from Mr. Turner on what I should do for sentence. 8 So, Ms. Kucharski. 9 MS. KUCHARSKI: Thank you, Your Honor. As the Court's aware, this matter was remanded for 10:27:03 10 11 sentencing. We are asking the Court at this time to 12 sentence Mr. Turner to the mandatory minimum of 180 months. 13 We believe that that's the sentence that's sufficient and 14 not greater than necessary, and we also believe that that's 10:27:23 15 the appropriate -- within the appropriate guideline range, 16 which, without the five levels that the Court chose not to 17 apply, Mr. Turner would be a 38 minus 3 for a total offense 18 level of 35, Criminal History Category I, and that 180 19 months would be encompassed within that range. 10:27:45 20 Also, as the Court is aware from our prior sentencing 21 memo, which was filed at the time of the original 22 sentencing, which we incorporate for this Court in our 23 updated sentencing memorandum, Mr. Turner --

THE COURT: Well, excuse me. I think

it's -- I think it's 40 -- well, I'm applying the

24

10:28:04 25

1 enhancement. I believe it's 40 minus 3 is 37. 2 MS. KUCHARSKI: Oh, you're correct, Your Honor. That was if he didn't apply the computer. 3 4 THE COURT: Right. So it's -- I should have -- it was my fault. I should have repeated it. These 10:28:19 5 are the findings I made initially, and they haven't changed. 6 7 It's a 40 minus the 2 levels for acceptance, a third level 8 off for a timely guilty plea. The government made that 9 motion before, so I'm obviously applying it. So it's a 37, Category 1, which is 210 to 262. There 10:28:36 10 11 is, of course, a 15-year, a 180-month mandatory minimum. 12 MS. KUCHARSKI: And, of course, the Court does 13 have discretion to vary downward from that sentence based on 14 Mr. Turner's background, history, and characteristics. 10:28:57 15 As we detailed in that original sentencing memo, he 16 suffered severe emotional, physical, and sexual abuse 17 growing up. He had a number of mental health issues which 18 continue to today. 19 Significant in his background, at one point -- which 10:29:16 20 we included in the exhibits to the initial sentencing 21 memorandum -- he was on a slew of a cocktail of mental 22 health medication as a young child, which basically left him 23 lethargic and unable to function. 24 He still suffers from mental health issues to this day, and significant since he's been sentenced -- and I'd 10:29:34 25

ask the Court to consider as a collateral consequence the type of time an individual like Mr. Turner has to serve once they go into the Bureau of Prisons with these type of offenses. I'd ask the Court to consider that as a collateral consequence.

For the year that he's been in custody, or over the year period that he's been in custody, he's basically had to check himself into the SHU unit, which is the segregated housing unit, because he's been threatened on the yard because of the bases of his offenses. So basically he is only allowed out a minimal time per day, and he has to ask for that for his own protection.

Now, I understand that recently the BOP has finally moved him to another facility, and he did report to me the other day when I met with him that things at least appear to be a little better for him there.

But that first year was a tremendously hard year for him, not only mental-health wise, but just basically being in fear for his safety and his life on a daily basis.

And I understand that he placed himself in that position with these types of charges, but you'd have to hope that, you know, when you're in custody, that you would be somewhat protected. But there are politics of the prison yard, and unfortunately, those are the politics of the prison yard.

10:29:55 5

10:30:11 10

10:30:33 15

10:30:51 20

10:31:10 25

I think based on his severe neglect and physical abuse as a child, that explains how he wound up to be in this situation. Even to this day when I meet with David, mentally -- or physically, he's a 27-year-old man, but mentally and emotionally, he's a 14-year-old kid.

His emotional growth was basically stunted by his background and history and basically the fact that he was turned over to the foster care system at the age of 7 and his mother never wanted him back. And, of course, she never would allow him to be adopted out either. So he bounced around from foster home to foster home and basically aged out of the system.

Now, he was fortunate during that period of time to come across one foster family that he does still stay in touch with that has been supportive of him. But basically that is the statement of his 27 years.

He really does not have any stable family background. His mother was a young mother who married a gentleman who was significantly older than she was. There was sexual abuse within the home, and as I've stated, physical abuse.

And we are asking the Court to take all of those things into consideration, and the fact that a significant sentence of 15 years will take Mr. Turner up to the point where he is approximately age 40. And as studies suggest, age 40 is that period of time where recidivism is shown to

10:31:31 5

10:31:52 10

10:32:10 15

10:32:30 20

10:32:49 25

1	start decreasing. It certainly gives him enough time to
2	
2	take advantage of all the prison programming that he can
3	with regards to sex offending and mental health. Obviously,
4	those are issues that will have to be addressed when he's on
10:33:10 5	supervision. You know, he's required I believe the Court
6	sentenced him to life supervision. So that's another
7	collateral consequence.
8	So, Your Honor, those are the reasons we're asking for
9	a sentence of 180 months.
10:33:24 10	Thank you.
11	THE COURT: All right. Thank you,
12	Ms. Kucharski.
13	Mr. Turner, anything you would like to say?
14	THE DEFENDANT: No, Your Honor.
10:33:33 15	THE COURT: All right. Mr. McDonough.
16	MR. McDONOUGH: May it please the Court, Your
17	Honor. The government would ask, again, for a guideline
18	sentence to be imposed in this case based on the sentencing
19	factors of 3553, the nature and circumstances of this
10:33:45 20	offense, and the history and characteristics of the
21	defendant.
22	As this Court is aware, the defendant traveled from
23	Tennessee to Ohio. He used Facebook to meet, coerce, and
24	entice the 14-year-old victim to engage in sexual activity.
10:34:04 25	Your Honor, the government would incorporate the prior

2.4

10:34:23 5

10:34:42 10

10:35:01 15

10:35:21 20

10:35:35 25

sentence memoranda and the arguments at that prior sentencing. The victim's mother spoke at that prior sentencing. She is not available today. But we would ask that her comments that she addressed the Court in her victim impact statement be incorporated again.

The defendant did engage in sexual activity with the victim, did videotape that using a smart phone to distribute that and sent that to an adult female in Wyoming with the goal that all three of them would have a sexual relationship and live together in Wyoming.

In considering the need for the sentence imposed, obviously, it's a very serious offense, as reflected in the guidelines; to promote respect for the law and to provide just punishment for this defendant, as the sentence would provide adequate deterrence both generally to offenders who use the Internet, use Facebook and social media sites to essentially manipulate vulnerable victims.

And in this case, the 14-year-old, she was manipulated into sending her baby-sitting money from Ohio to Tennessee so the defendant could use that for bus fare to go ahead and transfer to Ohio.

And it's certainly necessary -- the government does realize that the mitigation and the defendant's childhood and experiences that he's had. But it would be necessary to protect the public from future conduct by him.

Just even as noted in the PSR, the different types of communications and activities that this defendant has had with others.

Your Honor, so the government would like to thank the Massillon Police Department and the Canton Police Department for their assistance in the case that led the case to being adopted by the Cleveland Division of FBI's Canton resident agency, and Special Agent Suzanne Lewis-Johnson who is here today at the table for her work in this case.

Your Honor, with respect to the facts that -- the Court is absolutely right. The facts have not changed since our original sentencing.

The government does support the revised PSR and would agree with the Court regarding the use of the computer under Section 2G2.1(b)(6)(B)(ii), and that this defendant used his phone in videotaping and producing the depiction of sexual activity; used that to send that to the adult, Erian, and further had text messages to Erian indicating about engaging in a threesome with the minor victim. That computer was a tool that was used to solicit sexual activity.

With respect to -- and as indicated in paragraph 59 and paragraphs 25 and 35 of the PSR.

With respect to paragraph 64, that Chapter 4 enhancement, the government's original theory of the application of that was the defendant's prior conduct in

10:36:10 10

10:35:50 5

10:36:27 15

10:37:01 20

10:37:23 25

Wyoming.

10:38:47 25

10:37:37 5

10:37:53 10

10:38:15 15

10:38:29 20

The government provided testimony, and as it turns out, there was no prior conduct that would justify a pattern of activity. The government's alternate theory was that the sexual activity that the defendant engaged in with the victim, that that was a pattern of activity. There was three instances, a break, and then a fourth instance.

And as this Court will recall, it was a close call, but the Court found that that was within a 24-hour period and didn't justify a pattern of activity. The government's understanding that under the revised PSR for paragraph 64, that the United States Sentencing Commission offered an opinion that based on the defendant's other counts, the traveling and the coercion, that those actually apply for a pattern of -- a pattern of activity to justify the five-level enhancement.

So although the facts have not changed, that was just an alternate theory, and the government's understanding would be that the sentencing would be de novo, that the Court could go ahead and consider that. And so the Court is correct, the government did not waive -- the Court's interpretation that the government waived the other theories of it, that this would be actually a new theory, but the government certainly respects the Court's opinion regarding those two.

1 THE COURT: I'm not sure -- well, it seems to 2 me that if you thought I was wrong, you should have 3 cross-appealed. 4 MR. McDONOUGH: Correct, Your Honor. And --THE COURT: And I don't think you can raise it 10:39:00 5 now. But even so, I -- it's still a close call, but for the 6 7 reasons I said the first time, I'm not applying them. 8 MR. McDONOUGH: Thank you, Your Honor. 9 THE COURT: I think because all of his conduct with this victim was in a very short period of time. 10:39:14 10 11 MR. McDONOUGH: Yes. And as noted, Your 12 Honor, the Court -- the government had already previously 13 separate harms --14 THE COURT: Right. 10:39:24 15 MR. McDONOUGH: -- and the Court grouped them 16 together. So the government sees the Court's reasoning and 17 decision on that, Your Honor. 18 In any event, it is a serious offense. The government 19 does recognize the mitigation that the defense offered. But 10:39:37 20 in any event, Your Honor, there was harm done here to this 21 victim. It's a serious crime. And the government would ask 22 for another within guideline sentence to be imposed in this 23 case. THE COURT: Well, I gave a lot of thought, 2.4 10:39:52 25 Mr. Turner, to my sentence when I imposed it the first time,

and both sides made the same arguments. Those arguments still apply, but the reasoning I articulated the first time still applies, and I don't see any reason to change that. So I'm going to do the same thing.

I said when I sentenced you initially that I was very mindful of the horrific upbringing you had, and it had to have contributed to what you did in this case. No human could be unaffected by that kind of upbringing. But I still have to, at the end of the day, protect the community and impose a sufficient punishment. And I determined that, balancing everything, that the 238 months was appropriate. It was the 240, and then I gave you credit for two years of state time for which you would not — two months credit for state time, for which you otherwise would not get credit. So I ended up with 238, and that's what I'm going to do again.

And the way I fashioned it still applies. It's 238 months for Count 1; 238 months for Count 3; 238 months for Count 4; 120 months for Count 2, all sentences to run concurrent with each other. So that's a total of 238 months. Lifetime supervised release still applies with all the standard conditions — all the special conditions for sex offender and the standard conditions, so that hasn't changed.

I didn't impose a fine the first time; I'm not doing

10:40:15 5

10:40:41 10

10:41:04 15

10:41:23 20

10:41:44 25

1 it this time. There's a mandatory \$400 special assessment; 2 \$100 on each of the four counts I imposed the first time and I'm imposing the second time. I think that covers it. 3 4 And, again, Mr. McDonough emphasized that you used the computer, not only to lure the victim, your cell phone in 10:42:11 5 particular, which qualifies as a computer, but then you used 6 7 it to produce the child pornography because you videotaped 8 yourself and the victim having sex, and then you further 9 used that cell phone computer to distribute that film to another person with the object of having more sexual 10:42:32 10 activity with the victim. So it's clearly bound up in the 11 12 counts of conviction, and that's why I'm applying the 13 two-level enhancement. 14 All right. You do, sir, have the right to appeal the conviction and sentence. If you wish to do so, you have 42 10:42:49 15 16 days to file a Notice of Appeal. 17 Do you understand that? 18 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor. 19 THE COURT: Okay. Any general or specific 10:43:00 20 objections? 21 MS. KUCHARSKI: We would just renew our 22 previous objections, Your Honor, and nothing further. 23 THE COURT: Okay. 24 MR. McDONOUGH: Your Honor, on the issue of 10:43:09 25 SORNA, as well as the --

1	THE COURT: I'll impose that. The same SORNA,
2	Adam Walsh, that I imposed the first time, I'm imposing the
3	second time. No change.
4	MR. McDONOUGH: Thank you, Your Honor.
10:43:30 5	THE COURT: All right. I neglected to impose
6	a mental health aftercare as part of the supervised release
7	the first time. I don't know why, but that was an
8	oversight, and I think it's going to be necessary. So I
9	will add that.
10:43:47 10	Okay. Thank you, and we are adjourned.
11	MS. KUCHARSKI: Thank you, Your Honor.
12	MR. McDONOUGH: Thank you, Your Honor.
13	DEPUTY CLERK: All rise.
14	
15	(Proceedings adjourned at 10:46 a.m.)
16	
17	
18	
19	CERTIFICATE
20	
21	I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript
22	from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter.
23	
24	/s/ Donnalee Cotone 9th of November, 2017 DONNALEE COTONE, RMR, CRR DATE
25	NCRA Realtime Systems Administrator